



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/733,802

12/12/2003

Russell Smith

006242.00046

8820

31743 7590 05/31/2007

PATENT GROUP GA030-43

GEORGIA-PACIFIC LLC

133 PEACHTREE STREET, N.E.

ATLANTA, GA 30303-1847

EXAMINER

RUDDOCK, ULA CORINNA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1771

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/31/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/733,802

Applicant(s)

SMITH, RUSSELL

Examiner

Ula C. Ruddock

Art Unit

1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10,12-18,20 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14 and 15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10,12,13,16-18,20 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 14, 2007, has been entered.
2. The Examiner has carefully considered Applicant's amendment and accompanying response filed March 14, 2007. The previously set forth rejections have been maintained.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. Claims 1, 2, 7-10, 12 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colbert (US 2004/0154264) in view of Lightner, Jr. et al. (US 2005/0126430). Colbert discloses a coated gypsum board product comprising a gypsum core and facing sheets (abstract). The board can be coated with paper on both sides thereof [0012]. In some applications, the facing sheet is a paper blended with mineral or synthetic fibers [0067]. The coating contains calcium carbonate, fillers, latex emulsions, and perlite filler [0015]. A silicone derivative is added as a hydrophobic agent [0035]. It should be noted that the Examiner is equating the calcium carbonate and perlite filler of Colbert to be the same as Applicant's fillers and the latex emulsion of Colbert to be the same as Applicant's binder. It is the Examiner's position that "cured in place" is a method

step. It should be noted that the method of forming an article is not germane to the issue of patentability of the article itself. Therefore, this limitation has not been given patentable weight. Finally, the burden has been shifted to Applicant to show the unobvious differences between the claimed product and the prior art product. With regard to the limitation that the gypsum "partially penetrates into the fibrous facing material, because Colbert does not disclose any layer between the gypsum substrate and the paper facings, the gypsum material has to penetrate the fibrous facings to a degree in order to form a bond between the two layers.

Colbert discloses the claimed invention except for the teaching that the coating is a radiation curable coating formulation.

Lightner, Jr. et al. (US 2005/0126430) disclose a building article with bioresistant properties comprising gypsum composite materials. A biocidal agent is applied as a treatment to the fibers reinforcing the article (abstract). In one embodiment, the building article comprising a gypsum based core having two opposing surfaces and paper sheets bonded to the opposing surfaces [0009]. The biocide surface treatment can also contain a latex or other film forming material that may be dried by various types of curing methods. The curing methods include radiation curing such as UV and electronic beam curing [0026]. It should be noted that in Applicant's arguments, "high energy" is defined as UV or electronic beam radiation. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have used Lightner's method of radiation curing on the coating of Colbert, motivated by the desire to create a coating that is quickly dried, cured, and activated.

Regarding Applicant's limitation of an "aggregate material on the high energy radiation cured coating," it is the Examiner's position that because Colbert discloses in paragraph [0045] that the coating (which comprises the aggregate material) is applied to the facing sheet or the gypsum core to a uniform thickness that is preferably not sensitive to surface irregularities. It is the Examiner's position that this disclosure can be properly equated to Applicant's requirement that some of the aggregate material is on the coating.

Regarding claims 16-18, Applicant discloses in paragraphs [0064, 0065, 0069], that the coating formulation can comprises acrylic acid esters, which have ethylenically unsaturated double bonds. Colbert, in paragraph [0088], discloses acrylic acid esters as a preferred latex emulsion. Therefore, these limitations have been met.

Colbert and Lightner, Jr. disclose the claimed invention except for the teaching that the cured coating comprises a polymer present in an amount between about 20-99 weight percent.

***However, in the absence of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have optimized the amount of polymer material in the coating, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233. In the present invention, one would have optimized the amount of polymer present in the coating motivated by the desire to create a gypsum panel that is quickly cured and has good film forming properties.***

***Rejection is maintained.***

5. Claims 3-6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colbert (US 2004/0154264) and Lightner, Jr. et al. (US 2005/0126430), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Randall et al. (US 2003/0203191). Colbert and Lightner, Jr. et al. disclose the claimed invention except for the teaching that the facing material is a non-woven mat of glass fibers or synthetic fibers or a blend of synthetic and mineral fibers. Colbert and Lightner, Jr. et al. also fail to disclose that a water-resistant additive is added to the gypsum core.

Randall et al. (US 2003/0203191) discloses a mat-faced gypsum board comprising a set gypsum core sandwiched between and faced with mats of glass fibers (abstract). The fibrous mat comprises material that is capable of forming a strong bond with the set gypsum comprising the core of the gypsum board. Examples of such material include a mineral-type material such as glass fibers and synthetic resin fibers. The mat can be woven or nonwoven in form [0038]. The core of the gypsum board also preferably includes a water-resistant additive [0023], such as siliconates, wax emulsions, or organopolysiloxane [0033] and [0035]. It would have been obvious to have used the glass and synthetic facer material of Randall et al. as the facers in the product of Colbert and Lightner, Jr. et al., motivated by the desire to create a product having decreased delamination and increased strength. It also would have been obvious to have used the water resistant additive of Randall on the gypsum core of Colbert and Lightner, Jr. et al., motivated by the desire to create a gypsum product having increased water resistance.

***Rejection is maintained.***

6. Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Colbert (US 2004/0154264) and Lightner, Jr. et al. (US 2005/0126430), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Garnett et al. (US 6,162,511). Colbert and Lightner, Jr. et al. disclose the claimed invention except for the teaching that the coating further comprises a photoinitiator present in the amount from 0.05 to 20 weight percent.

Garnett et al. (US 6,162,511) disclose a substrate coating with a radiation curable composition comprising a photoinitiator (col 3, ln 25-40) in the amount of 0.1 to 15 % by weight (col 3, ln 53-56). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used Garnett's photoinitiator in the amount of 0.1 to 15% by weight in the coating of Colbert and Lightner, Jr. et al., motivated by the desire to create a radiation curable coating that is easily and quickly cured.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed March 14, 2007, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the reasons set forth. Applicant argues that the references do not teach or suggest a formulation that is cured, i.e. a curable formulation. This argument is not persuasive because if radiation is involved in drying, the Colbert coating would also be cured. Furthermore, the limitation of a "curable" coating has been treated as a "capable of" limitation. It has been held that the recitation that an element is "capable of" performing a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. *In re Hutchison*, 69 USPQ 138. Applicant also argues that Colbert and Lightner fail to teach that the polymer has ethylenically unsaturated double bonds and that the polymer is present in an amount between about 20-99% weight percent. As set forth above, Colbert and Lightner, Jr. do disclose a

Art Unit: 1771

polymer having ethylenically unsaturated double bonds (e.g. acrylic acid esters) and in the absence of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to have 20-99% polymer present in the coating, motivated by the desire to create a coating that is quickly cured. Therefore, the rejections are maintained.

### **Conclusion**

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ula C. Ruddock whose telephone number is 571-272-1481. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel H. Morris can be reached on 571-272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

UCR *UCR*

*Ula C. Ruddock*  
Ula C. Ruddock  
Primary Examiner  
Tech Center 1700